UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,225	07/24/2001	Roya Rezvani Sabeti		4914

7590 11/12/2004	EXAMINER
Roya Sabeti	PATEL, DHAIRYA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

Roya Sabeti
5610 - 80th AVE. CT. W.
UNIVERSITY PLACE, WA 98467

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/911,225	SABETI, ROYA REZVANI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dhairya A Patel	2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-38</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application # 09/911,225 was filed on 9/27/2004. Claims 1-38 are subject to

examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14-23,25-27,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 14-23,25-27,30 states the "whereby" which is a functional language. It

should be change to "wherein".

As per claim 15, Examiner does not understand what the applicant means by

"affinity rules". In the specification, the applicant does not mention "affinity rules" to

clarify the meaning of "affinity rules". Appropriate clarification is needed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language

Claims 1-6,26,27,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Allard et al. U.S. Patent # 6,018,619 (hereinafter Allard).

2. As per claim 1, Allard teaches a system of asynchronous communication

between clients and web servers, whereby the client requests data from the web

server, and the data is not immediately available; said request to data is

represented by an Asynchronous Hyperlink Object (AHO) and the web server

acknowledges the request to the client and fulfills the request at a later time

when said data is available. (column 9 lines 25-42).

3. As per claim 2, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1 whereby normal, or

synchronous, hyperlinks are converted to AHOs and AHOs are converted to

normal hyperlinks. (column 9 lines 25-42)

4. As per claim 3, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, comprising in addition of a

software or hardware component in the client and/or a separate system, said

component is herein defined as Client AHO Agent (CAHOA), and it's function is

to interact with the AHO on behalf of the client. (column 9 lines 57-64)

5. As per claim 4, Allard teaches a system as in claim 3, wherein the CAHOA is pre-

built or pre-installed in the client and/or other system or created/deployed in the

moment an AHO is created or deployed on behalf of the client. (column 9 lines

57-64)

6. As per claim 5, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, comprising in addition of a

software or hardware component in the Server system, said component is herein

defined as a Server AHO Agent (SAHOA), and it's function is to interact with the AHO on the server side. (column 9 lines 49-56)

7. As per claim 6, Allard teaches a system as in claim 5, wherein the SAHOA is pre-built or pre-installed in the server system or created/deployed in the moment the AHO is created. (column 9 lines 49-56).

8. As per claim 30, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1 whereby the web server behaves in the asynchronous model only and said web servers are herein defined as Asynchronous Web Servers. (column 9 lines 25-42).

9. As per claim 26, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, whereby the client request results in a specific type of AHO, wherein the web server informs the client that the web server will fulfill the request once the web server receives a predetermined number of similar requests, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Count-based AHO. (column 9 lines 25-42).

10. As per claim 27, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, whereby the client request results in a specific type of AHO, wherein the web server informs the client that the web server will fulfill the request once a predetermined condition is met, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Condition-based AHO. (column 9 lines 25-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-13,23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Allard et al. in view of Yanagihara et al. U.S. Patent # 5,715,443 (hereinafter

Yanagihara).

11. As per claim 7, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1 but fails to teach the AHOs

in progress are represented in the client system in a graphical user interface, wherein

said graphical user interface is standalone or part of an existing graphical user interface.

Yanagihara teaches progress of AHOs are represented in the client system in a

graphical user interface. (column 11 lines 20-40). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in

the invention of Allard to check the progress of the AHO's using graphical user

interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to monitor the status of the

request using the graphical user interface. (column 11 lines 20-40).

12. As per claim 8, Allard teaches a system as in claim 7, but fails to teach an icon

indicates when change occurs in the status of any one of the AHOs. Yanagihara

teaches an icon indicates when change occurs in the status of any one of the AHOs.

(column 11 lines 20-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard in

order to see when change occurs. The motivation for doing so would have been to

monitor the status of the request when the change occurs.   (column 11 lines 20-40).

13. As per claim 9, Allard teaches a system as in claim 7, but fails to teach each

AHO is further represented by an individual icon, herein defined as AHO Icon.

Yanagihara teaches each AHO is further represented by an individual icon. (column 11

lines 20-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard to come up

with individual icon. The motivation for doing so would have been show to each request

that were made previously and to differentiate between requests. (column 11 lines 20-

40).

14. As per claim 10, Allard teaches a system in claim 9, but fails to teach the AHO

Icon can change in form or color and said change represents or indicates that a change

has occurred in the AHO's process. Yanagihara teaches the AHO Icon can change in

form or color and said change represents or indicates that a change has occurred in the

AHO's process. (Column 11 lines 20-40). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in

the invention of Allard come up with color changing Icon which represents change

occurred in the process. The motivation for doing so would have been to check the

progress of the request made, so when the Icon changes form or color, it indicates

change in the process. (Column 11 lines 20-40).

15. As per claim 11, Allard teaches a system in claim 7, but fails to teach the

graphical user interface consists of a list and said list lists every AHO in progress.

Yanagihara teaches the graphical user interface consists of a list and said list lists every

AHO in progress. (Column 11 lines 4-45). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in

the invention of Allard to come up with list of every AHO in progress. The motivation for

doing so would have been to check the status of all the searches running in the list

(Column 11 lines 4-45).

16. As per claim 12, Allard teaches a system in claim 7, but fails to teach every AHO

whose process ends successfully goes to the history list. Yanagihara teaches every

AHO whose process ends successfully goes to the history list. (column 12 lines 24-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard to come up the history list.

The motivation for doing so would have been to check on the previous request that

were done and to see which requests are not done. (column 12 lines 24-35)

17. As per claim 13, Allard teaches a system in claim 7, but fails to teach an AHO

that is terminated by the client or server prior to its completion becomes an Orphan

AHO and goes to the orphan list. (column 12 lines 24-35). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of

Yanagihara in the invention of Allard in order to come up with orphan list. The

motivation for doing so would have been to check on the unfinished request. (column 12

lines 24-35).

18. As per claim 23, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, but fails to teach the

client request results in a specific type of AHO, wherein the server schedules the

completion time for the request and the client is notified of said scheduled completion

time, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Time-based AHO. Yanagihara teaches

the client request results in a specific type of AHO, wherein the server schedules the

completion time for the request and the client is notified of said scheduled completion time, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Time-based AHO.(column 15 lines 42-67) (column 16 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard in order Time-based AHO. The motivation for doing so would have been to know the exact time on which the request is going to be complete. (column 15 lines 42-67) (column 16 line 1).

19. As per claim 24, Allard teaches a system of claim 23, but fails to teach said specific date and time is a periodic event. Yanagihara teaches the specific date and time is a periodic event. (column 15 lines 64-67) (column 16 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard to come up with a periodic event. The motivation for doing so would have been to schedule a request periodically.

As per claim 25, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 23, but fails to teach the resulting AHO fulfills the request in a periodic manner until a final event is reached. Yanagihara teaches the resulting AHO fulfills the request in a periodic manner until a final event is reached. (column 15 lines 43-67) (column 16 line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include teaching of Yanagihara in the invention of Allard to fulfill the request in a periodic manner until a final event is reached. The motivation for doing so would have been to schedule and finish the request periodically until the last request.

Claims 14-20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Allard et al. in view of Subramanian et al. U.S. Patent # 5,694,547 (hereinafter

Subramanian).

20. As per claim 14, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach

the client request cannot be exactly fulfilled by the web server and instead, the

fulfillment consist of at least one alternative. Subramanian teaches the client request

cannot be exactly fulfilled by the web server and instead, the fulfillment consist of at

least one alternative. (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the

invention of Allard in order to come up with another alternative if the request is not

fulfilled. The motivation for providing another alternative would have been so that

request can be fulfilled something similar to the original request.

21. As per claim 15, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 14, but fails to teach

the nature of the alternative is governed by "affinity rules" or a system that determines

or selects items that are close or related to the original request. Subramanian teaches

the nature of the alternative is governed by "affinity rules" or a system that determines

or selects items that are close or related to the original request. (column 25 lines 40-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard in order to come up with an

alternative which is close or related to the original request. The motivation for providing

another alternative would have been so that request can be fulfilled something similar to

the original request.

22. As per claim 16, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 14, but fails to teach

the alternative consists of at least one new AHO request. Subramanian teaches the alternative consists of at least one new AHO request. (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard in order to come up with at least one new AHO request. The motivation for doing so would have been to fulfill the request with at least one item which is close or similar to the original request.

23. As per claim 17, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, but fails to teach the web server cannot fulfill the client's request exactly because of an error in the request, said web server corrects said client's request. Subramanian teaches the web server cannot fulfill the client's request exactly because of an error in the request, said web server corrects said client's request (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard in order so that error in the client's request can be fixed which will fulfill the client's request. The motivation for doing so would have to fulfill the client's request in which if the error occurred it will be fixed by the server.

24. As per claim 18, Allard teaches a system as in claim 17, but fails to teach the fulfillment consists of modifying the client request and automatically fulfilling said modified request. Subramanian teaches the fulfillment consists of modifying the client request and automatically fulfilling said modified request (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard in order modify the client request and fulfill the modified request. The motivation for doing so would have been to

provide load balancing among the resources because it would have save time for automatically fulfilling the request and also would process another request in the meantime.

25. As per claim 19, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 17, but fails to teach the modified request is presented to the client before proceeding to fulfill the request. Subramanian teaches the modified request is presented to the client before proceeding to fulfill the request. (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard in order to present the client the modified request. The motivation for doing so would have been to notify the client of the change in the original request.

26. As per claim 20, Allard teaches a system as in claim 17, but fails to teach the client request cannot be exactly fulfilled by the server and instead, the web server notifies the client and requests that the client modify the request. Subramanian teaches the client request cannot be exactly fulfilled by the server and instead, the web server notifies the client and requests that the client modify the request. (column 25 lines 40-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Subramanian in the invention of Allard so that the client can modify the request so come up the request that could be fulfilled. The motivation for doing so would be have the client come up with the alternative request which may fulfill the request by the client.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Allard et al. in view of Leighton et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication #

2002/0124080 A1 (hereinafter Leighton).

27. As per claim 21, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, whereby the client

request results in a specific type of AHO, but fails to teach the server is able to predict

the completion time and the client is notified of this time, and said type of AHO is herein

defined as a Predictable AHO. Leighton teaches the server is able to predict the

completion time and the client is notified of this time, and said type of AHO is herein

defined as a Predictable AHO. (Paragraph 40 lines 1-27). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Leighton

in the invention of Allard in order to predict completion time it will take to complete

request. The motivation for doing so would have been to find out how much completion

time it will take to complete request so that the request can be assigned to the server

with the best connectivity. (Paragraph 40 lines 1-27).

28. As per claim 22, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, whereby the client

request results in a specific type of AHO, but fails to teach the server does not or is not

capable of predicting the completion time for the request and the client is notified of the

undetermined completion time and said type of AHO is herein defined as an

Unpredictable AHO. Leighton teaches the server does not or is not capable of predicting

the completion time for the request and the client is notified of the undetermined

completion time and said type of AHO is herein defined as an Unpredictable AHO.

(Paragraph 40 lines 1-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of invention to include teaching of Leighton in the invention of Allard because

just in case the server cannot determine the completion time for the request the client

will be notified. The motivation for doing so would have been because it would have

been hard to predict completion time because Internet is highly bursty and exhibits

highly variable traffic conditions.

Claims 28-29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Allard in view of Vange et al. U.S. Patent Publication # US 2002/0004796A1 (hereinafter

Vange).

29. As per claim 28, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, whereby the client

request results in an AHO but fails to teach the fulfillment of the AHO is based on a

server-side priority system or rating. Vange teaches client request results in an AHO

and the fulfillment of the AHO is based on a server-side priority system or rating.

(Paragraph 86 1-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention to include teaching of Vange in the invention of Allard so that there is a

server-side priority system for request fulfillment. The motivation for doing so would

have been so that all the request fulfillment will be in order they were received by the

server.

30. As per claim 29, Allard teaches a system as in claim 1, but fails to teach at least

one standby server, which is functional whenever the web server is unavailable for any

reason, said standby server acknowledges the receipt of requests from all clients, and

generates AHO agents in response to the requests, so that no client request is ignored.

Vange teaches at least one standby server, which is functional whenever the web

server is unavailable for any reason, said standby server acknowledges the receipt of

requests from all clients, and generates AHO agents in response to the requests, so

that no client request is ignored. (Paragraph 86 lines 1-15). Therefore it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include

teaching of Vange in the invention of Allard in order to provide request receipt when the

server is down. The motivation for doing so would have been so that none of the

requests from the clients are ignored when the server is down.

Claims 31-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Allard in view of Burdick et al. U.S. Patent # 5,625,816 (hereinafter Burdick).

31. As per claim 31, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach

an AHO can terminate without completely fulfilling the client's request. Burdick teaches

an AHO can terminate without completely fulfilling the client's request. (column 8 lines

56-67) (column 9 lines 1-2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in the invention of

Allard to terminate the request without fulfilling the request. The motivation for doing so

would have been to save the server from going down because some request may cause

the server to go down.

32. As per claim 32, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach

the termination is determined by a set of predetermined rules. Burdick teaches the

termination is determined by a set of predetermined rules. (column 8 lines 56-67)

(column 9 lines 1-2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in the invention of Allard to terminate the request with set of predetermined rules. The motivation for doing so would have been in order to terminate the request; the request has to fall under certain predetermined rules, which may allow terminating the request.

33. As per claim 33, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach the client initiates the termination of an AHO without the client request being fulfilled. Burdick teaches the client initiates the termination of an AHO without the client request being fulfilled. (column 8 lines 67) (column 9 lines 1-2). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in the invention of Allard to let client terminate without the request being fulfilled. The motivation for doing so would have been because client had already found the results for the result or may be server asked the client to terminate the request.

As per claim 34, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach an AHO, upon termination, generates at least one additional AHO, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Derivative AHO. Burdick teaches an AHO, upon termination, generates at least one additional AHO, and said type of AHO is herein defined as Derivative AHO. (column 9 lines 14-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in the invention of Allard to come up with derivative AHO. The motivation for doing so would have been to make another request after terminating the first request.

34. As per claim 35, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 1, but fails to teach

upon the termination of an AHO, the client determines the generation of derivatives
AHOs. Burdick teaches upon the termination of an AHO, the client determines the
generation of derivatives AHOs. (column 9 lines 14-26). It would have been obvious to
one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in
the invention of Allard to come up with generation of derivative AHO's. The motivation
for doing so would have been because the client wants to make another request after
termination of the first request.

35. As per claim 36, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 35, but fails to
teach the derivative AHOs are automatically deployed. Burdick teaches the derivative
AHOs are automatically deployed. (column 9 lines 14-26). It would have been obvious
to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include teaching of Burdick in
the invention of Allard to come up with derivative AHO's. The motivation for doing so
would have been to continue with another request after termination of the first request.

36. As per claim 37, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 35, but fails to teach
derivative AHOs can generate at least one additional derivative AHO. Burdick teaches
derivative AHOs can generate at least one additional derivative AHO. (column 9 lines
14-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to include teaching of Burdick in the invention of Allard to come up with at
least one derivative AHO. The motivation for doing so would have been to continue
with at least one another request after termination of the first request.

37. As per claim 38, Allard teaches a system as defined in claim 35, but fails to teach

the generation and deployment rules of derivative AHOs are determined by other AHOs

or derivative AHOs. Burdick teaches the generation and deployment rules of derivative

AHOs are determined by other AHOs or derivative AHOs. (column 9 lines 14-26). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

include teaching of Burdick in the invention of Allard come up with the generation and

deployment rules of derivative AHO's. The motivation for doing so would have been so

that in order to make another request after the termination of the first request it has to

follow certain generation and deployment rules so that not all terminated request are

allowed to make another request.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

39. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent

prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in

this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention

disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or

agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon

skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or

agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents

Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication

is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

40. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4066. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP

ZARNI MAUNG/
PRIMARY EXAMINER